



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/960,416

09/21/2001

Robert M. Dombroski

65507

5532

27975

7590

11/02/2005

ALLEN, DYER, DOPPELT, MILBRATH & GILCHRIST P.A.  
1401 CITRUS CENTER 255 SOUTH ORANGE AVENUE  
P.O. BOX 3791  
ORLANDO, FL 32802-3791

EXAMINER

CHOI, PETER H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3623

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/960,416

Applicant(s)

DOMBROSKI, ROBERT M.

Examiner

Peter Choi

Art Unit

3623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 September 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 September 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/9/01.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-29 are pending in the application.

#### ***Priority***

2. Applicant is awarded the priority filing date of September 21, 2000 and the claims will be examined accordingly.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-4, 6, 8-9, 11, 13-15, 17-18, 20-23, 25, and 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Smith et al (U.S Patent #5,835,376).

As per claim 1, Smith et al. teaches a system, operable over the public switched telephone network (PSTN) and Internet, for use in providing services to a claimant by a

Art Unit: 3623

service vendor, as scheduled by a scheduler, and paid for by a payor, the system comprising:

(a) a server (**database server 10**) for processing and storing claimant data (**for storing records indicating requested vehicle services and associated information**) and connected to the Internet (**customers may enter data into database server 10 over a telephone connection 15; incoming requests may also be accepted by various other methods, for example, remote facilities may enter information over a radio, or satellite, or Internet; computing systems communicate with database server 10 over a wide-area of Internet network**) [Column 4, lines 45-47, 56-58, Column 7, lines 3-4; Figure 1]; and

(b) at least one scheduler workstation for scheduling services for a claimant (**customers 14 may also possess remote data entry terminals at which the customers may enter data into database server 10 over a telephone connection 15; incoming requests may also be accepted by various other methods, for example, remote facilities may enter information over a radio, or satellite, or Internet**) [Column 4, lines 45-47, 56-58; Figure 1] and comprising:

(i) a scheduler computer connected to the server for entry of claimant data by the scheduler and display of claimant data to the scheduler (**requests for vehicle service may be entered by call takers at the location of the database server, or may be entered remotely via telephone, either at a data terminal at a customer site or via touch-tone telephone or at an ATM-like facility using a customer identification card**) [Column 3, lines 4-8]; and

Art Unit: 3623

(ii) a telephone interface connected to the PSTN for communication between the scheduler and at least one of the payor, claimant and service vendor (**call takers 12 receive telephone requests from customers such as customer 13**)

[Column 4, lines 50-52];

(c) the server comprising a quality assurance unit (**monitoring process 28**)  
for:

(i) generating requests to the scheduler computer before and after the scheduled service for contacting the claimant (**monitoring process 28 determines whether the vehicle is late for arrival at the pickup site and warns human dispatchers 16 so that the appropriate action can be taken, for example, calling the customer to inform them that the vehicle will be late; process 28 proceeds to step 160 to write a record to the exception file 32 including a reason code indicating that automated dispatching failed because the vehicle was late to the pickup site**) [Column 19, lines 49-67]; and

(ii) generating requests to the scheduler computer before the scheduled service for contacting the service vendor (**create mobile data terminal message for the vehicle selected to be dispatched for pickup; the mobile data terminal request incorporates much of the data in the dispatch record, including the patient's name and phone number; this information is obtained by referencing a patient information file using the patient ID found in field 28 of the dispatch record**) [Figure 3M-1; Column 17, lines 2-26]

Art Unit: 3623

Claim 14 recites similar limitations to those of claim 1(c); therefore, the same rejection applies.

As per claim 2, Smith et al. teaches a system according to claim 1 wherein the services comprise at least one of transportation (**vehicle dispatching**), and language translation [title, abstract], and wherein the quality assurance unit generates requests to the scheduler computer during the scheduled service to verify the service is being provided (**monitoring process 28 determines whether the vehicle is late for arrival at the pickup site and warns human dispatchers 16 so that the appropriate action can be taken, for example, calling the customer to inform them that the vehicle will be late**) [Column 19, lines 49-67].

Claim 21 recites similar limitations; therefore, the same rejection applies.

As per claim 3, Smith et al. teaches a system according to claim 1 wherein the services comprise at least one of transportation (**vehicle dispatching**), translation, delivery of durable medical equipment (DME), and delivery of pharmaceuticals [title, abstract].

Claims 15 and 22 recite similar limitations; therefore, the same rejection applies.

Art Unit: 3623

As per claim 4, Smith et al. teaches a system according to claim 1 wherein the server comprises a report generation unit (**monitoring process 28**) for generating at least one of completed-service (**step 134 to determine if the vehicle has arrived**), late-service (**steps 137 and 138 to determine if the vehicle is late**), canceled-service, and missed-service reports (**write an exception record to the exception file 32 identifying the dispatch and including a reason code indicating either that the vehicle was late or that automated dispatching failed because the vehicle was late to the pickup site in its status report**) on the server (**database server 10 for storing records indicating requested vehicle services and associated information**) for access via the Internet (**database server 10 communicates with AVL systems and computing systems running processes 24, 26, and 28 over a wide-area or Internet network**) [Column 4, lines 45-47, Column 7, lines 1-4, Column 19, line 49 – Column 20, line 65; Figure 5].

Smith et al. does not explicitly teach the step of providing payors with access to reports via the Internet. However, it is inherent that if reports are made available on an Internet-accessible server, the payor would be able to access said reports, assuming they are provided with adequate administrative purposes (password authentication, access to restricted web pages, etc.). It is also inherent that service providers that generate and transmit electronic invoices to the payor through the Internet can use the same Electronic Data Interchange methods to transmit other electronic documents (such as reports); thus, Smith et al. meets the limitations of the claim.

Furthermore, this difference is only found in the non-functional descriptive material and is not functionally involved in the steps recited nor does it alter the recited structural elements. The recited method steps would be performed the same regardless of who is able to access and view the reports. Further, the structural elements remain the same regardless of who is able to access and view the reports. Thus, the people able to access and view the reports will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, *see In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994); *MPEP* § 2106.

Claim 23 recites similar limitations; therefore, the same rejection applies.

As per claim 6, Smith et al. teaches a system according to claim 4 wherein the report generation unit also generates at least one of a transport-type report (**output vehicle file 36; Transport Type {Wheelchair/Basic/AdvancedLifeSupport} found on Dispatch File 30**), claimant transport report (**Dispatch File 30**), claimant employer transport report (**Contract number found on Dispatch File 30**), transportation savings report (**Invoice file 34; Base rate codes, Mileage rate codes, Extra services rate codes found on Dispatch File 30**), list of claimants report (**Automated Dispatch Requests File 44; Patient ID number found on Dispatch File 30**), transport by county (**Pickup Location, Pickup Latitude, Pickup Longitude, Destination Location,**



Art Unit: 3623

**Destination Latitude, and Destination Longitude count on Dispatch File 30) and ICD-9 transport report (Transport ID Number, Vehicle ID Number on Dispatch File 30) [Column 7, line 36 – Column 8, line 65, Column 17, lines 9-37; Figure 2, 3].**

Claims 13 and 25 recite similar limitations; therefore, the same rejection applies.

As per claim 8, Smith et al. teaches a system according to claim 1 wherein the server comprises a billing unit for verifying service performed by the service vendor and for generating bills for the payor **(generating an invoice for the activities performed by vehicles 20 upon customer request; invoice files 34 contain detailed information used to generated invoices of the kind needed)** [Column 7, lines 37-40, Column 9, lines 49-67].

Claims 17 and 27 recite similar limitations; therefore, the same rejection applies.

As per claim 9, Smith et al. teaches a system according to claim 1 wherein the service comprises transportation and the billing unit verifies mileage of transportation provided by the service vendor **(automatically deliver, during vehicle dispatch, the exact route which will be used by Government or insurance agencies in verifying the mileage charges accumulated by the vehicle; automatically perform such verification upon an ambulance service invoice to determine if the mileage**

Art Unit: 3623

**charges on the invoice are within parameters set by a Government or insurance agency)** [Column 18, lines 36-56].

Claims 18 and 28 recite similar limitations; therefore, the same rejection applies.

As per claim 11, Smith et al. teaches a system, operable over the public switched telephone network (PSTN) and Internet, for use in providing services to a claimant by a service vendor, as scheduled by a scheduler, and paid for by a payor, the system comprising:

- (a) a server for processing and storing claimant data and connected to the Internet [see analysis of claim 1(a) above]; and
- (b) at least one scheduler workstation for scheduling services for a claimant [see analysis of claim 1(b) above] and comprising:
  - (i) a scheduler computer connected to the server for entry of claimant data by the scheduler and display of claimant data to the scheduler [see analysis of claim 1(b)(i) above], and
  - (ii) a telephone interface connected to the PSTN for communication between the scheduler and at least one of the payor, claimant and service vendor [see analysis of claim 1(b)(ii) above];
- (c) the server comprising a report generation unit for generating at least one of completed-service, late-service, canceled-service and missed-service reports on the server for the payor to access via the Internet [see analysis of claim 4 above].

As per claim 20, Smith et al. teaches a method, operable over the public switched telephone network (PSTN) and Internet, for use in providing services to a claimant by a service vendor, as scheduled by a scheduler, and paid for by a payor, the system comprising:

- (a) a server for processing and storing claimant data and connected to the Internet [see analysis of claim 1(a) above];
- (b) scheduling services for a claimant via at least one scheduler workstation [see analysis of claim 1(b) above] which comprises:
  - (i) a scheduler computer connected to the server for entry of claimant data by the scheduler and display of claimant data to the scheduler [see analysis of claim 1(b)(i) above], and
  - (ii) a telephone interface connected to the PSTN for communication between the scheduler and at least one of the payor, claimant and service vendor [see analysis of claim 1(b)(ii) above];
- (c) generating requests to the scheduler computer before and after the scheduled service for contacting the claimant [see analysis of claim 1(c)(i) above]; and
- (d) generating requests to the scheduler computer before the scheduled service for contacting the service vendor [see analysis of claim 1(c)(ii) above].

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

Art Unit: 3623

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 5, 7, 10, 12, 16, 19, 24, 26, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al. (U.S. Patent #5,835,376).

As per claim 5, Smith et al. teaches a system according to claim 4 wherein the reports (**invoice record**) are downloadable (**generated and transmitted, leading to electronic payment**) by the payor on the payor computer (**another alternative is that the invoice records might be transmitted to customer sites**) [Column 21, lines 21-30].

Official Notice is taken that it is old and well known in the art that spreadsheets are used to store numerical data, such as billing information and expenses; thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Smith et al. to include the step of providing downloadable reports into a spreadsheet document, because the resulting invention would provide customers with the raw data needed to maintain their expenditure records, and to perform their own Ad Hoc queries and calculations relating to the expenses incurred.

Art Unit: 3623

Smith et al. does not expressly teach the spreadsheet document as recited in claim 5; however, this difference is only found in the non-functional descriptive material and is not functionally involved in the steps recited nor does it alter the recited structural elements. The recited method steps would be performed the same regardless of the spreadsheet document. Further, the structural elements remain the same regardless of the spreadsheet document. Thus, the spreadsheet document will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, *see In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994); MPEP § 2106.

Claims 12 and 24 recite similar limitations; therefore, the same rejection applies.

As per claim 7, Smith et al. does not explicitly teach a system according to claim 1 wherein the server comprises a payor secure online ordering unit for permitting the entry and review of claimant data on the server via the Internet.

Smith et al. does teach the step of generating and transmitting an electronic invoice for services {via the Internet}, leading to electronic payment, inherently allowing the payor to use a computer to view the billable charges.

Official Notice is taken that it is old and well known in the computing arts to provide a security measures for exchanges of sensitive information online. Access to

Art Unit: 3623

information can be restricted using a plurality of means that are old and well known in the art, including password authentication, limiting access to users on the Intranet or users having proper security clearance, Internet security (HTTPS, SSL) protocols, etc. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Smith et al. to include a secure online ordering unit because the resulting combination would prevent unauthorized users from tampering with sensitive financial information, confidential information (account numbers, etc.).

Claims 16 and 26 recite similar limitations; therefore, the same rejection applies.

As per claim 10, Smith et al. does not explicitly teach a system according to claim 1 wherein the payor is a workers compensation insurer and the claimant is a workers compensation claimant.

Smith et al. does not expressly teach the identify of the payor or claimant (as a workers compensation insurer and claimant) as recited in claim 10; however, this difference is only found in the non-functional descriptive material and is not functionally involved in the steps recited nor does it alter the recited structural elements. The recited method steps would be performed the same regardless of the identify of the payor and claimant. Further, the structural elements remain the same regardless of the identity of the payor and claimant. Thus, the spreadsheet document will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, *see In re Gulack, 703*

Art Unit: 3623

*F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); In re Lowry, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994); MPEP § 2106.*

Furthermore, Official Notice is taken that it is common knowledge that users requiring ambulatory services may have incurred injuries on the job and will file a claim with their workers compensation insurer for payment of ambulatory services. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Smith et al. to include the step of obtaining the identify of the payor and claimant, because the resulting combination will enable service providers to bill the payor and/or claimant according to any payment package that may be a result of a previously agreed upon arrangement (such as discounted mileage rates, surcharges, etc.).

Claims 19 and 29 recite similar limitations; therefore, the same rejection applies.

### ***Conclusion***

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Ur (U.S Patent #6,615,046) teaches a method for automatically dispatching mobile services. A connection is established over a cellular network between a client

Art Unit: 3623

and one of a plurality of mobile providers of a service. A database is maintained comprising a plurality of mobile providers of the service. A communication from the client is received requesting the service, and a suitable provider is automatically selected, responsive to the communication and to the parameters in the database, including proximity to the customer.

Gaspard II (U.S Patent #6,240,362) teaches a method of scheduling a vehicle in real-time to transport freight and passengers. Transportation requests are received over a communications network from a freight terminal and/or a passenger terminal, which are interconnected through an Internet Service Provider over a network.

Patel (U.S Patent #5,953,706) teaches a transportation network system which integrates communications and data transmission requirements for ground transportation service providers into a single, centrally controlled network. Communications networks (such as the Internet and the World Wide Web) are used as the data distribution backbone between the various service providers.

Jones et al. (U.S Patent #6,117,073) teaches an integrated emergency medical transportation database system. Billing information can be submitted electronically through a wireless LAN, cellular network, or dedicated or dialup phone line in an appropriate format which reduces the accounts receivables times for each patient



Art Unit: 3623

encounter. A statistical database is used to store and extract statistical information from data entered during patient encounters.

Smith et al. (U.S Patent #6,430,496) teaches a system for controlling vehicles to provide transportation services. A database stores records each documenting needed transportation services.

Sisley et al. (U.S Patent #5,467,268) teaches a system for assigning and scheduling resource requests to resource providers that use a modified "best-first" search technique that combines optimization, artificial intelligence, and constraint-processing to arrive at near-optimal assignment and scheduling solutions.

Vance et al. (U.S Patent #6,442,526) teaches a system for corporate travel planning and management. The system comprises a Travel Planning module, and Travel Expense Reporting module. Travel Expense Reporting module receives trip and card data and expense policy data from the corporate database. The Travel Expense Reporting module also sends expense detail data and summary expense totals to the corporate database. Travelers can request a list of preferred rental car vendors.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter Choi whose telephone number is (571) 272 6971. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5.

Art Unit: 3623

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on (571) 272-6729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PC

October 28, 2005

Peter Choi  
Examiner  
Art Unit 3623

*Susanna Diaz*

**SUSANNA M. DIAZ  
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

*AU 3623*